UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/605,376	09/25/2003	William Vroman	PL002-0001	2375

37621 7590 01/04/2007

PATENTS AND LICENSING LLC
DANIEL W. JUFFERNBRUCH
28 BARRINGTON BOURNE
BARRINGTON, IL 60010-9605

EXAMINER	
AGWUMEZIE, CHARLES C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3621	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	01/04/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/605,376	VROMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Charlie C. Agwumezie	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 September 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 7, 9-10, 19-28, and 30-43* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-2, 7, 9-10, 19-28, and 30-43* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *7, 9, 10 and 30* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01/23/04*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status Of Claims

1. Claims 3-6 and 8 are cancelled. Claims 11-18 and 29 are previously cancelled. Claims 39-43 are newly added. Claims 1, 2,19, 20, 21, 23, 25 and 28 are amended. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9, 10, 19-28, and 30-43 are pending in this application per the response to office action filed on October 10, 2006.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed October 10, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to independent **claims 1 and 19**, Applicant argues that neither Ghahremani et al nor Mazza et al disclose or suggest the "chassis comprising a plurality of card slots and a common backplane bus" and "system manager card" for receiving feature keys representing activation rights for features and the "plurality of application cards operatively disposed in a plurality of slots" as recited in independent claims 1 and 19.

In response Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's Characterization and submit that Ghahremani et al in combination with Mazza et al discloses all the recited features of independent claims 1 and 19 as shown in the rejections below. Examiner is not aware of network switches such as Cisco switches which does not provide a chassis for housing the various cards or card/expansion slots for inserting the various cards for expansion purposes. Both Ghahremani et al and Mazza et al

discloses a switching system or equipment as claimed in the independent claims 1 and 19.

Applicant further argues that neither reference suggest the claimed allocation of "feature units." According to Applicant's specification feature units refers to number of permissible units for a feature which designate number of application cards that are permitted to use the feature. Alternatively the number of permissible units for a feature can designate the number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted for the feature.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that both references does disclose allocation of "feature units". Ghahremani et al discloses that the FM 10 and the resources manager 38 manages and allocates local resources including digital modem and ISDN switched resources (see 0081). Mazza et al discloses providing information relating to the features to be enabled. Mazza also discloses providing list of permitted features, the name and version number for the telecommunication application making the request.. Mazza further discloses a numeric value designating how many ports (number of cards permitted?) are licensed and/or how many licenses for the product are granted... (see 0042; 0045; 0046; 0048; 0057).

Applicant also argues that neither of the references teaches the claimed receipt of a key by a system manager card in a chassis for the purposes of allocating features to application cards over a common backplane bus to slots of at least one chassis. Mazza et al do not disclose or suggest the system manager card or application card element nor their chassis arrangement with slots or a common backplane bus.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant characterization of Mazza's invention. Mazza et al discloses a telecommunication switching system, which is used to control enablement of features (fig. 1; 0004; 0020). Network or telecommunication switches such as Cisco switches generally have chassis and backplane and most switches offers empty slots for additional application card if needed. Applicant's argument/assertion that Mazza et al does not disclose or suggest the system manager card or application card element is not correct. Mazza et al is replete with activation keys for the purpose of allocating features to application cards in a chassis as claimed.

As per **claims 2, 7, 9, 10, 20-28 and 30-43**, Applicant argues contains the limitations of their corresponding independent claims 1 or 19 and are patentable over Ghahremani et al in combination of Mazza et al. Applicant further argued that dependent claims 2, 10, 20-28, 30, 33 and 37 contain additional limitations which are not taught or suggested by the references of record.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that these claims are neither patentable being dependent on their respectively independent claims nor for the claimed additional limitation recited therein.

Applicant also argues that neither of the reference discloses telecommunication features.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees and asserts that both references discloses telecommunication features.

With respect to **claims 31, 35, 32 and 36**, Applicant argues that Summers et al does not suggest, alone or in combination that "the common backplane bus of the chassis is a trusted bus" (claim 31 and 32) or that the common backplane bus of the chassis connects the plurality of application cards to the system manager card over trusted intra-card bus" (claim 35 and 36). In the present inventions the common backplane bus is trusted because it is on one or more chassis that the two cards (system manager and the individual application blade) reside.

In response, Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's characterization of both Ghahremani et al and Mazza's invention. Both inventions disclose switching equipment/system. As argued above, examiner is not aware of any switching equipment or system such as Cisco switches without expansion slots to enable the user to add other services or networks as needed. These slots are interconnected by a common bus and communicate with any other card through intra card bus. The system manager card and others cards are usually trusted because they reside on the same chassis and /or on a common bus. The use of Summers et al reference was actually to avoid this kind of argument being advanced by the Applicant. Thus switches for example Cisco switches inherently have expansion slots for additional blades and usually reside on a common chassis and/or bus.

With respect to **claims 34 and 38**, Applicant argues that Salkini et al does not discloses or suggest the enablement of a prepaid billing feature on application cards in a chassis.

In response examiner respectfully disagree and submits that Ghahremani et al discloses that FM and PM allow a user to provide a wide ranges of services and support a wide range of applications on application-specific daughter cards (0052) but does not specify prepaid billing as an example of services to be provided. Salkini et al discloses that one of the feature services that can be enabled on the system include billing and prepaid services (see fig. 85; col. 2, lines 30-40).

Claim Objections

3. **Claims 7, 9, 10, and 30,** are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 7 is dependent on a cancelled claim 3. Claim 9 depends on itself. Claim 10 and 30 depends on a cancelled claim 8 Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 7, 9-10, 19-28, 30, 33, 37, 39 and 41-43, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghahremani et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0180429 A1 in view of Mazza et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199760 A1.

As per **claim 1 and 19**, Ghahremani et al discloses a feature rights management system, comprising:

a feature rights server having a repository for storing feature keys, the feature keys representing activation rights for features including feature units;

a chassis comprising a plurality of cards slots and a common backplane bus for connecting cards among the slots to one another (fig. 1, 14, 17, 33, 34; 0049);

a system manager card operatively disposed in a slot of a chassis, the system manager card comprising a feature rights management agent operatively coupled to the feature rights server to receive feature keys from the feature rights server, to store feature rights in a repository, and to identify available feature units provided (fig. 1, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 33, 34; 0055; 0058; 0069; 0070; 0071); and

a plurality of application cards operatively disposed in a plurality of slots of at least one chassis, each application card operatively coupled to the system manager card over the common backplane bus to request feature rights from the feature rights management agent, wherein the feature rights management agent allocates the feature units among requesting plurality of application cards over the common backplane bus (fig. 1, 3, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 33, 34; 0055; 0071).

What Ghahremani et al does not explicitly teach is

a feature rights server having a repository for storing feature keys, the feature keys representing activation rights for features including feature units.

Mazza et al discloses a feature rights server having a repository for storing feature keys, the feature keys representing activation rights for features including feature units (see figs. 1, 2 and 3; 0057; 0059; "...obtain the list of permitted features...").

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights server having a repository for storing feature keys, the feature keys representing activation rights for features including feature units as taught by Mazza et al, because such method ensures that only permitted features are activated thereby enhancing the security of the system.

As per **claim 2 and 21**, Ghahremani et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights server transfer rights between the feature rights management agents and the server in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between the application cards and the feature rights management agent in the form of permission;

wherein a connection between the feature rights management agents and the feature rights server is un-trusted; and

wherein a connection between the sub-agents and the feature rights management agent is trusted.

Mazza et al discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights server transfer rights between the feature rights management agents and the server in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between the application cards and the feature rights management agent in the form of permission (see figs. 4 and 5; 0116)

wherein a connection between the feature rights management agents and the feature rights server is un-trusted (fig. 1; 0049; remote feature activation system or server connect to switch via PSTN...); and

wherein a connection between the sub-agents and the feature rights management agent is trusted (fig. 1; ...agent and subagent reside within the switch..).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights server transfer rights between the feature rights management agents and the server in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between the application cards and the feature rights management agent in the form of permission as taught by Mazza et al, because, if the client application is licensed and the database contains a record of a license, the response can allow the client application to be enabled, or re-enabled.

As per **claim 7 and 25**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the feature management agent releases feature keys from a feature rights management agent and moves feature rights keys to the feature rights server (0164; 0165).

As per **claim 9 and 27**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein each feature unit designates how many instances of a feature category is permitted within a domain of a distribution node identified by the distribution node identifier (0178).

As per **claim 10**, Ghahremani further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the feature keys are of at least two kinds of keys: network keys destined to the feature rights server and element keys destined for the feature rights management agent (fig. 10; 0083; 0084; 0103).

As per **claim 20**, Ghahremani et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights source transfer rights between themselves in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between themselves in the form of permission.

Mazza et al discloses disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights source transfer rights between

themselves in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between themselves in the form of permission (see figs. 4 and 5; 0116).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agents and the feature rights source transfer rights between themselves in the form of keys; and wherein the application cards and the feature rights management agent transfer rights between themselves in the form of permission as taught by Mazza et al, because, if the client application is licensed and the database contains a record of a license, the response can allow the client application to be enabled, or re-enabled.

As per **claim 22** Ghahremani et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the application card requests permissions for feature rights from the feature rights management agent upon provisioning.

Mazza et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the application card requests permissions for feature rights from the feature rights management agent upon provisioning (0048).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the application card requests permissions for feature rights from the feature rights management agent upon provisioning as taught

by Mazza et al because, the response sent by the licensing server does not allow the application to be enabled if the feature is not licensed.

As per **claim 23**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the feature rights management agent comprises a memory for storing a number of unallocated feature units (0065; 0164; 0165); and wherein the feature rights management agent requests keys for features from the feature rights server when the number of unallocated feature units is deficient to meet the needs of a request for permissions by a application card (0165; 0020).

9. As per **claim 24**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the application card releases a feature unit by sending a release message to the feature rights management agent; and wherein the feature rights management agent increases its number of available feature units in response to the release message (0164; 0165).

As per **claim 26**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein each feature key comprises a plurality of feature rights including a) feature units, b) a feature category, and c) a distribution node identifier (0098; 0154; 0155; 0178).

As per **claim 28**, Ghahremani further discloses a feature rights management apparatus, wherein the feature keys are of at least two kinds of keys: network keys destined to the feature rights server and element keys destined for the feature rights management agent, wherein, the distribution node identifier of an element key identifies a domain of an identified feature rights management agent, and wherein the distribution node identifier of a network key identifies a domain of an identified feature management server (fig. 10; 0083; 0084; 0103; 0124; 0125; 0126).

As per **claim 30, 33, and 37**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the features comprise telecommunication features (fig. 1, 3, 12, 15, 17; 0084; 0086).

As per **claim 39**, Ghahremani et al discloses a feature rights management apparatus wherein

the feature units designate a number of application cards that are permitted to use a feature (0055; 0147; 0151; "...maximum number of modems allocated to the VR on the FM..."); and

wherein the feature rights management agent allocates the feature to application cards (0055; 0081; 0147; 0151).

As per **claim 41**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management apparatus wherein

The feature units designate a maximum use for a feature (0152); and

Wherein the feature rights management agent re-allocates the feature rights among application cards when application cards are removed and replaced in the chassis (0147; ...resources are shared among various cards...)

As per **claim 42**, Ghahremani et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management apparatus wherein

the feature units designate a maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature; and

wherein the feature rights management agent allocates the maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature to application cards.

Mazza et al discloses the feature units designate a maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature (see claim 30); and

wherein the feature rights management agent allocates the maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature to application cards (see claim 30).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the feature units designate a maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature; and

wherein the feature rights management agent allocates the maximum number of simultaneous telephone calls that are permitted to use a given feature to application cards as taught by Mazza et al because, in order to track the number of calls corresponding to the prepaid amount.

As per **claim 43**, Ghahremani et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management apparatus wherein

the feature keys further include a destination ID; and simultaneous

wherein the feature rights management agent confirms that the destination ID matches a serial number of the hardware of the feature rights management apparatus.

Mazza et al discloses a feature rights management apparatus wherein

the feature keys further include a destination ID (0010; "...contains serial number that matches the serial number of the processor...."); and

wherein the feature rights management agent confirms that the destination ID matches a serial number of the hardware of the feature rights management apparatus (0010).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the feature keys further include a destination ID; and wherein the feature rights management agent confirms that the destination ID matches a serial number of the hardware of the feature rights

management apparatus as taught by Mazza et al because, in order to ensure that data is received by the intended apparatus.

5. **Claims 31, 35, 32 and 36,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghahremani et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0180429 A1 and Mazza et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199760 A1 as applied to claim 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Summers et al U.S. Patent No. 6,098,133.

As per **claim 31 and 35**, both Ghahremani et al and Mazza et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the common backplane bus of the chassis is a trusted bus.

Summers et al discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the common backplane bus of the chassis is a trusted bus (fig. 1, 2, 6 and 7)

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the common backplane bus of the chassis is a trusted bus as taught by Summers et al in order to ensure adequate security and reliability because "...the switch preferably includes a redundant bus architecture for interconnecting the FMs and SCMs..." (Ghahremani, 0052; 0058).

As per **claim 32 and 36**, Ghahremani et al further discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the common backplane bus of the chassis connects the plurality of application cards to the system manager card (fig. 1) but failed to explicitly disclose over a trusted intra-card bus.

Summers et al discloses a trusted intra-card bus (fig. 1, 2, 6 and 7).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a trusted intra-card bus as taught by Summers et al in order to ensure adequate security.

6. **Claims 34, 38, and 40,** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ghahremani et al U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0180429 A1 and Mazza et al U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0199760 A1 as applied to claim 1 and 19 above, and further in view of Salkini et al U.S. Patent No. 6,912,230.

As per **claims 34, 38 and 40**, both Ghahremani et al and Mazza et al failed to explicitly disclose a feature rights management system, wherein the features comprises prepaid billing. Ghahremani et al however discloses that FM and PM allow a user to provide a wide ranges of services and support a wide range of applications on application-specific daughter cards (0052) but does not specify prepaid billing an example of services to be provided.

Salkini et al discloses a feature rights management system, wherein the features comprises prepaid billing (see fig. 85; col. 10, lines 1-10; col. 2, lines 30-40).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ghahremani et al and incorporate a feature rights management system, wherein the features comprises prepaid billing as taught by Salkini et al in order to ensure that providers are paid for the services.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art ad are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of

the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles C. Agwumezie whose number is **(571) 272-6838**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday 8:00 am – 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on **(571) 272 – 6712**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300. [Official communications; including After Final communications labeled "Box AF"].

(571) 273-8300. [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"].

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the United States Patent and Trademark Office Customer Service Window:

Randolph Building,

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria VA. 22314

Charlie Lion Agwumezie
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 3621
December 18, 2006

A Fischer 12/22/06

ANDREW J. FISCHER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600